DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 363 EA 016 322

AUTHOR Kirkpatrick, Samuel A.
TITLE Educational Administration and the Social, Policy, and Administrative Sciences.
INSTITUTION Iowa Univ., Iowa City. Inst. for School Executives.
PUB DATE Oct 83
NOTE 9p.; An earlier version of this paper was presented as the Walter Cocking Lecture at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (37th, Missoula, MT, August 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT Executive Review; v4 n1 Oct 1983

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Business Administration Education; Decision Making; Educational Administration; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Politics; Public Administration Education; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *Policy Research

ABSTRACT

The politics of education has been ignored in educational administration programs; it has been not enough taught in American programs for educational administrators and not enough emphasized in discussions of administrative roles. Administration increasingly includes political as well as rational decisions. Thus, administrators need a unified study of policy research to help incorporate decision-making information from various social sciences. Such a policy science is now being developed and, despite its present neglect, should influence the curriculum of educational administration programs in the future. However, simply introducing social science into educational administration curricula would be insufficient; a specialized body of knowledge that includes the particular problems and solutions of educational administrators must be developed. To this end, empirical studies of educational policy-making must be considered together with theories of professional practice. A unified theory of administrative practice might best arise from comparing the standards and morphologies of public, business, and educational administration programs; a better integration of administrative programs would clarify and support policy research in educational administration. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Volume 4, Number 1
October 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Executive Review

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Bozeman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Institute for School Executives
The University of Iowa

ED239363

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE SOCIAL, POLICY, AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES*

Samuel A. Kirkpatrick

The purpose of this paper is to critically address, from a cross-disciplinary perspective, what has been and is being done now in educational administration programs, who is doing it, and what should be done. These will be central themes, but I will examine them interactively along several lines of inquiry organized by cross-disciplinary perspectives from the social, policy, and administrative sciences. The result is a foray into and across the various fields and disciplines—a morphological investigation of sorts, as opposed to a substantive or theoretical one. What follows is a commentary on preparation programs from the perspective of the politics of education, the politics of administration, the policy sciences, the social sciences generally, and the administrative sciences as they are represented by a branch of the social sciences—public administration.

The Politics of Education

As I begin with the particular and move to the more general, I would like to first address the politics of education and its role in the curriculum. Our schools have become political battlegrounds where our administrators are faced by heightened political activities and the politicization of teachers, the board, and the public. They are now more subject to political influences beyond the school—from the community, from various layers of government—and as practitioners, they themselves are engaging in political activity. Both forces are reshaping their behavior and their role.

To better prepare them, we now have a greater opportunity than ever to incorporate some exciting and relevant topics into the curriculum and onto our research agendas: state legislative and school board politics; interest groups; electoral behavior and public opinion; community politics and power; judicial politics and law; elite recruitment; school policy formation, implementation, and impact; the politics of educational finance; school desegregation; the politics of evaluation; political socialization; and the effects of education on politics, government control, and educational bureaucracies.[1]

I will not belabor the relevance of these topics and I am not naive about the constraints on fully incorporating them into the educational administration curriculum. There are boundary problems and confusion about the focus and scope of the field, coupled by a lack of any concerted effort to set priorities on the research agenda. This fledgling field will continue to suffer identity problems and to reflect a lack of community among researchers who come at it as an outgrowth of their own primary discipline. The curricular constraints are real—so much to cover in so little time, decisions about whether to do it "in-house" or in the discipline of political science, the insularity of specialization, classic academic turf problems, and so on. But it must be done—the demands are too great and the possibilities too real to avoid.

I am also not particularly encouraged by the current state of affairs regarding the incorporation of these topics into the curriculum. From a large sample of professors of educational administration, largely in the U.S., we find no serious reference to the politics of education when they report their teaching duties.[2] When they were asked to report courses they taught at least once a year, the list produced no references to the politics of education, or at least too few to report. The closest category was 11 percent devoted to "education and law." Such a survey cannot capture courses taught beyond educational administration departments. However, it is speculated that while many of us would agree conceptually on the need for significant political content in the curriculum, this conceptual agreement far outdistanced what is actually evident in degree programs. This appears to be the case, especially for the United States. Although the data are from the 1960s, they show a remarkable gap between what professors perceive (or perhaps conceptually desire or selectively perceive)

EA 016 322

*An earlier version of this paper was presented as a Walter Cocking Lecture at the Thirty-Seventh Annual National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration in August 1983 at the University of Montana. I would like to thank Robert Stalcup, John Hoyle, and Harvey Tucker for their helpful advice, and Dale Carlson for his assistance.

to be the frequency of use of social science courses in doctoral programs and what actually takes place as evidenced by a graduating student's record.[3] The discipline perceived to be the most frequently used is political science—with 70 percent of educational administration department chairs claiming that its courses are "usually" incorporated in graduate degree programs. And the claims for the other social sciences are high as well. But when we examine the percentage distribution of social science courses actually taken, we find that over half of the graduate students surveyed took less than 10 percent of their work in the social sciences.

Our schools have become political battlegrounds where our administrators are faced by heightened political activities and the politicization of teachers, the board, and the public.

The pattern appears to be somewhat different in Canada, as reflected in a survey of graduate students' programs in 30 Canadian universities in the mid-70s.[4] Out of ten content areas for all three graduate degrees (master's, Ph.D., and Ed.D.) the three common areas were, in order, organizational theory, statistics, and administrative theory. Between 70 percent and 100 percent of the students in all three types of programs included courses in these common areas. Interestingly, the politics of education ranked sixth for master's and fourth for Ph.D. and Ed.D. students; that is, the fourth most central course focus at the doctoral level was *not* curriculum, supervision of instruction, educational psychology, history or philosophy, or the sociology of education, but rather the politics of education.

In addition to the substantive or intellectual rationale, what of the needs of practitioners in the field? In an interesting experiment, we have some evidence to indicate that a demand exists for educational administration specialists with political skills. When superintendents in large districts in two states were presented four contrived dossiers of candidates for a major staff position in their office—reflecting four model candidates, the instructional leader, the politico, the manager, and the technician—the candidate with disciplinary grounding in political science, political staff experience, and political mediator skills generally came in ahead of the instructional leader and the technician. Furthermore, the superintendents in this sample overwhelmingly selected the "political model" candidate as the one with the background most like theirs and the one who would approach administration most like they do.[5] I am not necessarily suggesting that "market research" should shape our degree programs, but both the management and political skills and knowledge appear to be critical in the eyes of experienced practitioners. Is the curriculum responsive to their needs?

Over a decade ago, Farquhar and Martin identified four "major recent trends" in the preparation of educational leaders. The first of these was the movement to more theoretically based substance in the social sciences. They suggested that the "administrator has come to be viewed as an applied social scientist . . . ."[6] While there is no doubt that theoretical constructs drawn from the social sciences have played an important role in the theoretical aspects of the curriculum and that social science methodology has helped begin an empirical research transition in educational administration, the rich substantive contents of the social sciences—those elements necessary for contextual understanding—have not been as fully integrated. Indeed, part of the trend cited was for educational administration departments to distance themselves from education in the disciplines.

The Politics of Administration

Not only do educational administrators live and work in a political environment, but they face the predicament of being caught between the rational and the political in policymaking and implementation.[7] In addition to understanding the internal state of the organization, the administrator must cope with and analytically comprehend the state of the environment—what public administration calls the "context of administration." This has probably always been the case and it is even more necessary today, for our school organizations no longer exist in a laissez-faire environment (as far as the community and the government is concerned)—there is less emphasis on the authority of leadership and less deference to professional expertise. The demands of participatory democracy and accountability counter the older, more simplistic professional-rational-scientific approaches to administration. The administrator often becomes a mediator in an adversarial context.

Although this dilemma is relatively new to conceptual understanding within educational administration, those of us in public administration have been grappling with it ever since Woodrow Wilson spoke of the politics and administration dichotomy—arguing in the early part of this century that the two are separable. What is now commonly called the "new" public administration no longer subscribes to the separation. The field of educational administration has the advantage of not having spent 30 or 40 years in incessant argument over the issue.

Not only do educational administrators live and work in a political environment, but they face the predicament of being caught between the rational and the political in policymaking and implementation.

As recent as 1977, Downey[8] argued that educational administration must begin to take this marriage into account; that is, both the rational and the political in policymaking. And this is what the social sciences, especially political science, are trying to do—to take a more comprehensive view of policymaking. This is going to take what is commonly called "policy research" which produces information useful both for making decisions and for discipline research.[9] Both types of activities will have to be engaged in simultaneously, and they will have to take place both within educational administration and within the social sciences. While the educational administration research agenda on merging information useful for making decisions and the more traditional, theory building, and testing lags by about a decade, there

is a rich and growing body of knowledge to provide assistance. Indeed, the body of "policy science" knowledge in the social sciences is sufficiently in place to begin to have a planned impact on the curriculum in educational administration.

The Policy Sciences

It is safe to contend that the postwar revolution in the policy sciences, especially during the last 15 years, has not had the profound impact it should on the curriculum in educational administration, even though some policy research is being done within educational administration. This interdisciplinary polyglot, led primarily by the social sciences and political science in particular, is acquiring the momentum of a discipline or a cluster of disciplines, much as we speak of the "administrative sciences."

Our school administrators, in the public schools and in postsecondary education, necessarily—by design or circumstance—play a major role in most stages of the policy process: from the identification of problems and the development of programs, to the implementation, evaluation, and termination of programs. They are initiators, facilitators, implementers, planners, power brokers, analysts, adjudicators, bargainers, and mediators. They mediate between competing external interest groups, between the organization and its ultimate political authority, between the organization and other government organizations, and among interests within the organization.[10] An understanding of policymaking and the policy process becomes imperative; and as a consequence, the contemporary substance, theory, and analytical rigor of the policy sciences must work its way more effectively into the graduate curriculum. Such topics include theories of incrementalism, satisficing and rational choice; of interest groups; bargaining; systems analysis; voting; and individual and group decision making.

Although the details, findings, and theories inherent in the policy science movement are too numerous to recount here, the most recent volume of *Review of Research in Education* contains an extensive review essay which is both informative and provocative, especially since it attempts to delineate how educational administration stands to gain from policy research.[11] The most noteworthy potential benefits include the rejection of an apolitical approach to administration, the incorporation of the universal as well as the particular in theoretical conceptualization, an amelioration of the schism between practitioners and researchers, and the application of multimethodological approaches and models to similar problems.

I quote from Grant Harman:

> The story is told that during the Crimean War a committee of inquiry called upon the British Surgeon-General to testify regarding gross inadequacies in the medical services at the front. The Surgeon-General's defense was simple: "Our medical services," he said, "would be perfectly adequate were it not for the causalties." Perhaps our response should be in a similar vein. Policy-making in education is in fine shape, except for the casualties: the fact that, often, we have a limited understanding of the complexities of the policy process; the fact that our policy-making structures are under attack; the fact that policy outputs often do not live up to expectations; and the fact that education policy must be made and implemented in an increasingly difficult environment. In essence, my point is that we can secure some help from the wide range of conceptual tools and frameworks that are available, and that in educational administration further study of the policy process should have a high priority.[12]

Social Scientific Theoretical Foundations and the Clinical Interface

The simple introduction of more social science, politics of education, or policy science content in the curriculum is not likely to be sufficient if carried out in the more usual, conventional, or routine disciplinary fashion. If the preparation of educational administrators is in a state of disarray, if it has no clear identity, or if it is schizophrenic as some would argue,[13] let me assure you that it is not alone. As one sage counselor once said, "We didn't all come over on the same ship, but we are all in the same boat."

Political science, and especially public administration, struggles as well between the tensions of an applied profession, an applied science, and a scientific discipline. There is undoubtedly a clinical focus in educational administration; and to the extent that the profession attempts to be an applied one, it must wrestle with some problems not necessarily faced by the purer sciences. Several of the prerequisites for an applied profession are of interest here:[14] there must be a grounding in the relevant disciplines coupled by the development of specialized bodies of knowledge and a knowledge of clinical problems.

Public administration struggles between the tensions of an applied profession, an applied science, and a scientific discipline.

The social or policy sciences have no empirical "laws" to offer, but they do have useful theoretical frameworks. The challenge is to delineate the relevance of such concepts to the actual practice of administration. That is, we need to explore ways to integrate this knowledge with clinical problems faced by administrators, to gain knowledge of what the clinical problems are and incorporate them into the curriculum, and to proceed to develop specialized bodies of knowledge of use to administrators. This is a very difficult challenge which requires the joint effort of social and policy scientists, educational administration scholars, and administrators. And while to some extent it has been advanced in political science and public administration and in the business schools, such programs are not far ahead and the challenge faces all of us.

My concerns are not unlike those of Jack Culbertson[15] when he calls for the development of a "theory of practice." The challenges of such a theoretical redirection are not unique to educational administration; indeed, there are important parallels in theoretical development between the social sciences and educational administration, even though the latter field may lag slightly behind the "disciplines." There is no doubt that our research needs to be more theoretically sophisticated, but continued progress on this front need not occur in an environment of antipathy to a more applied theory of practice.

Scientific Theory and Empirical Research. There are important substantive and theoretical parallels between educational administration and the social sciences. Any survey of the *Journal of Educational Administration* or *Educational Administration Quarterly* will show major and recurrent topics common to or borrowed from the social sciences: bureaucracy, leadership, deci-

sion making, policymaking, and the politics of education.[16] Across various theoretical categories, educational administration has drawn more from the social sciences than from other fields: role theory, organization theory, systems theory, leadership theory, theories of bureaucracy, compliance theory, decision theory, and so on.[17] Our theoretical work in the social sciences is also not an alien topic to scholars in the area of educational administration. Nevertheless, I *do* want to briefly pursue some observations about the integration, or lack thereof, of social scientific theory in the work of educational administration.

Across various theoretical categories, educational administration has drawn more from the social sciences than from other fields.

It has been 25 years since Halpin[18] thoroughly analyzed the problems which impede theoretical developments in educational administration. At the same time that he held out promise for the relevance of social scientific theory, among other problems he noted the tendency for social science theoretical work to be more taxonomic than theoretical. Indeed, social science "theory" at this time was less specific, less internally rigorous, less parsimonious, and less capable of producing specific, testable hypotheses. It tended to be this macro, grand, and taxonomic work which found its way into educational administration literature and the curriculum—and that has continued to cause some frustration in the development of empirical research. It has also resulted in some disillusionment with the social sciences and that may be even more harmful than the original antipathy to theory itself.

A curious paradox now exists, which, unfortunately, may be inherent in the development of science and specialization. The social sciences have progressed theoretically beyond much of the work that still serves as a reference for the development of educational administration theory and have done so by developing "smaller" theories of the middle range and numerous tests of smaller sets of interrelated propositions. This has been both the cause and the result of increased specialization, and while it has made the "disciplines" more scientific, it has resulted in new barriers to communication. Paradoxically, it is now more difficult to achieve precisely what the educational administration "theory movement" wanted—testable and tested hypotheses. The social sciences have more to offer, but it is much more complex, diverse, and difficult to grasp. While a reading of a Parsons, Merton, or Easton might have sufficed two decades ago, that is no longer the case. There are more reasons to *not* give up on the social sciences than ever before, but the endeavors associated with using our knowledge produced by our revolution require greater motivation, sustenance, and more thorough training in the social sciences themselves.

These developments, as well as lags in the literature of educational administration, suggest a need for some contemporary stocktaking. The flurry of activity and excitement over the social sciences and their potential relevance which occurred in the 1950s and 60s—such as those tied to the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE)—produced integrative review volumes which are no longer reflective of the middle range theories and empirical work representing current social science. Although the NSSE yearbook series includes a relatively recent and more specialized volume on the politics of education,[19] there has not been a yearbook which generally addresses the social sciences in all their complexity, at least much beyond the content found in the 1964 yearbook on behavioral science.[20]

The most recent comprehensive stocktaking was stimulated by UCEA, as reflected in the volume *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders*.[21] That volume, however, is essentially the work of the 1960s, providing both a very general orientation and one which reflects the social sciences in a more formative period. The political science portion of this volume, for example, is so general as to make little reference to research on the politics of education and it is so classical in its approach as to not address an important subfield of the discipline and one with direct relevance to educational administration—public administration[22] (which, incidentally, some traditional political scientists hope will go away because of its clinical and applied complications).

In sum, educational administration has gone through many of the same phases as the social sciences reflecting a 1950s and 60s commitment to macro theory (the metatheoretical stage). Educational administration's disillusionment with theory may today be more profound than that in the social sciences (including more serious flirtations with phenomenology), but we must be patient to encourage the *empirical* work; not give up on scientific theory; and allow time to test, retest, accept, and discard. As Willower reminds us, "when theory fails to provide quick answers to complex problems, impatience goaded by frustration takes over, and the faint-hearted give up on theory and retool those relics of a more naive time, the slogan and the recipe."[23]

We have finally recognized that the classical dichotomy is false—that value problems are inherent to scientific endeavor.

While the incredible excitement of the metatheory movement has also cooled in the social sciences, I believe we are now performing the necessary empirical work more successfully—the scientific drudgery of building and testing theories of the middle range. And in the process of these accomplishments, we too have shifted to a more inductive mode of inquiry and as we also wrestle with the "value free" issue, we have finally recognized that the classical dichotomy is false—that value problems are inherent to scientific endeavor.

The Scientific-Clinical Interface. There are clearly parallels in our frustrations as well. Even though educational administration theoretical frameworks are drawn heavily from the social sciences, ours are drawn from other places as well! Social science

theories often remain undifferentiated for our field, just as those in educational administration often remain undifferentiated or are not applied with specificity to educational organizations. The "clinical" and applied challenges of the social sciences must not be forgotten. To call them "disciplines" and to subsequently reify their scientific practices neglects the fact that we too must build theories of professional practice, especially in fields like public administration and social work. We are also made up of professionals and practitioners; it may be worth watching us. There needs to be a better understanding of the common tensions we face; that is, one must not simply look to the social sciences for content, scientific theory, or methodology—educational administration needs to observe and help us also develop useful theories of practice as we each attempt to build *professions* which are guided by more particular theories specific to each of our contexts. Quite frankly, the contexts are not radically different, although it is clear that progress will be hampered unless more social scientists focus their inquiry on educational organizations.

Educational administration needs to observe and help us develop useful theories of practice as we each attempt to build professions.

The parallels between the fields are so striking that I could easily have written the following about many aspects of the social sciences, just as Culbertson has written of educational administration: "As professionals, who have sought for more than seven decades to understand theory and practice and the complexity of their interrelationships, we have been subject to continuing and inelectable tensions. We have, in other words, struggled with the dilemmas inherent in efforts to link specialization and general perspectives, scholarly inquiry and clinical experience, detachment in scholarship and commitment to change, basic and decision research and the real and the ideal."[24]

My prescription in this regard is not necessarily a new one, but I would like to suggest a new possibility that has only recently been present in the social sciences. Generally, social science content has twofold relevance for the education of school administrators:[25] (1) to provide a conceptual structure to separate the relevant from the irrelevant; and (2) beyond this conceptual knowledge, the administrator must know how the concepts can be used diagnostically to solve organizational or community pathological problems. With the growth of the applied movement in the social sciences and the development of certain subdisciplines, or in some cases, almost separate disciplines, such as public administration, we now share more common features with educational administration, especially its professional practice and diagnostic or clinical mode. This *should* result in a reversal of the trend cited over a decade ago by Goldhammer, that "it is increasingly difficult to get educational and administrative relevance from the social scientists . . . ."[26]

I am concerned about the research base on both ends of the disciplinary linkage, in this case, public administration and educational administration. If we want to progress, either independently or together, toward a better research understanding of our subject matter, the distinctions must be made and the generic Ph.D. must be bolstered. If educational administration occasionally suffers from an inferiority complex, I assure you that it is not alone. I embarrassingly report the results of a recent study of doctoral dissertations in public administration, and I expect that such findings would be even more pessimistic in educational administration:

> A substantial number of dissertations are so conceptually faulty that they fall short of normal minimum standards for doctoral study; less than a quarter of the dissertations use methodologies that allow the reader to assign validity to the findings; less than half of the dissertations attempt to test a theory or reach a conclusion that contains a causal statement; less than half of the dissertations deal with subjects that are generally considered to be central to the field.[27]

Some changes in educational administration are needed as well. As Campbell and Newell contend:

> Frequently in educational administration we have vacillated between these two positions at one time emphasizing basic knowledge and theoretical development and at another time the problems confronting the practitioner in the field of practice. We can not settle for one or the other; there must be a continual interaction between the two. Our concern is that professors generally seem somewhat complacent about both of these mainsprings of the profession.[28]

Indeed, theoretical and empirical research progress faces a severe constraint within the field. According to the Campbell and Newell report, only 22 percent of professors of educational administration were involved in scholarly research in excess of 20 percent of their time; only 15 percent listed making a substantial contribution to knowledge as their ultimate goal; only 22 percent wanted to be noted or remembered for an idea or theory of lasting importance; only 11 percent ranked research and writing as the first priority; and unfortunately, less than half were able to concentrate efforts full-time in the field of educational administration. Although this report of the professoriate is a decade old, it does not bode well for the kind of development I am suggesting.

The Administrative Sciences

I have already made some casual references to the administrative sciences, and although the term may be as much of a misnomer as the policy sciences, their basic and applied components are evident and the extent to which educational administration draws from them is relatively clear. Education for administrative functions occurs in three primary loci on our college and university campuses.

Business and private sector administration programs are almost always housed in separate schools of business administration, with a few additional programs being conducted by the independent sector and for-profit schools. They have standards as set by their professional accrediting associations.

Secondly, public administration programs are found either as a subfield of political science, or somewhat less frequently, as autonomous departments in comprehensive public administration/public affairs schools, as public policy programs with less emphasis on administration, and as generic management pro-

grams—typically as a subelement of a combined public affairs and business school. These programs are guided by standards set by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).

Third, we have educational administration programs typically as departments in comprehensive colleges of education. In addition to certification requirements, program guidelines come from AASA and NCATE.

Except for a few experiments in "generic administration," the primary and overwhelming characteristic of these three efforts is their autonomy—organizationally within our universities, organizationally by professional associations, and organizationally by the structure for disseminating information and research, typically in specialized journals unique to each field (with *Administrative Science Quarterly* being a possible exception). They are also interpersonally autonomous as characterized by limited interaction, and they are frequently intellectually autonomous through the development of specialized disciplines and degree programs. Yet ironically, there are important common administrative functions performed by the graduates of all three sets of programs, such as the old POSDCORB skills: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

Where are we in this triad of real and potential relationships, especially with an eye toward breaking down the barriers of autonomy without seriously threatening our historical structures which have developed for so many different reasons that it would be naive to recommend a blanket dismantling? Oddly enough, educational administration may be the "odd man out," but only in relative terms. Public administration and its accrediting association have probably been the most integrative and outreaching. This has been stimulated not entirely by intellectual considerations or the needs of our graduates, but also by threats in the marketplace, within our university organizational structures, and by threats to our legitimacy. The curriculum and to some extent the organizational structures reach out to the business schools and to some concern for generic management. The management associations are also responding by creating public administration sections; and new organizations are evolving, such as a new one in public management.

Business schools have their standards and they know their morphology. Public administration has its standards and it now knows its morphology. Educational administration has its standards and we presumably know its morphology.[29] But do we know each other's standards and each other's morphology? The answer is essentially no. This is a serious matter, especially given the "public" component of educational administration and public administration and certain important commonalities in our standards. For example, the typical public administration curriculum, according to NASPAA standards, must have a fair dose of organization and management concepts, much as the new AASA standards have a focus on the behavioral and social sciences, administrative theory, planning, and personnel administration. Both sets of standards also require competencies in research design, quantitative analysis, and program evaluation and they both emphasize the political, legal, economic, and social context—both institutions and processes—of administration.

The field of public administration has just recently recognized its morphological ignorance of private sector programs, but reference is never made to educational administration. What do we need to begin a new dialogue regarding the education of administrators, whether in government, business, or in the schools?[30]

Recommendations

1. We need a description of the similarities and differences in skills which the public administration, management, and educational administration curricula attempt to impart.

2. We need an assessment of the educational differences which are due to inherent differences between government, the private sector, and the schools in comparison to an assessment of the differences which are due to accident or tradition.

3. We need to explore which public administration skills without counterparts in the management or educational administration curriculum have potential applications in the private sector and the schools; which management skills more unique to management programs have potential application in the public sector, both government and the schools; and which educational administration skills without counterparts in public administration or management have potential application in business and government.

4. We need to know how these considerations relate to the differences between advanced research degrees (the Ph.D.) and advanced professional degrees, such as the M.P.A., M.B.A., D.P.A., and Ed.D. This will help us to better clarify and articulate our curricula, but it will also enable us to separate some tasks and focus on the product.

5. And finally, we need a detailed *comparative* morphology of all three fields, not just in terms of the curriculum and standards, but in terms of organizational structure, faculty, overall requirements, internship experiences, admissions, off-campus programs, and so on.

I have not attempted to recount or develop a full matrix of relationships between the social sciences and educational administration, for that has been done rather nicely by William Harrison.[31] He develops a typology of "relevance" cells by pointing to the basic dimensions of the social sciences—theoretical, substantive findings, procedural or methodological, and normative—and relates them to four ways the social sciences have an impact on educational administration: in providing a liberal education, by entering in mutual interaction or exchange, by developing relevant and more specialized substructures or subdisciplines, and in establishing logical connections with the practical problems in applied settings. It seems to me that the latter two—the development of subdisciplines and the connections to applied settings—hold most promise for future developments relevant to the preparation of academic administrators. We have three primary substructures developing—the politics of education, public administration, and the policy sciences; and all of them are providing logical connections to practical problems through theories, substantive findings, methodology, and even value or normative concerns. This theme needs to be pursued, these cells of the matrix need to be embellished, and the educational administration curriculum must be a reflection of the effort.

FOOTNOTES

1. Generally see Paul Peterson, "The Politics of American Education," in Fred Kerlinger and John Carroll, eds., *Review of Research in Education II* (Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1974), 348-89; Frederick M. Wirt, "Reassessment Needs in the Study of the Politics of Education," *Teachers College Record* 78 (May 1977):401-12; Jay D. Scribner, ed., *The Politics of Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977); Laurence Iannaccone and Peter J. Cistone, *The Politics of Education* (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1974); Frederick M. Wirt, "The Use of Political Science in the Study of Educational Administration," in G. L. Immegart and W. L. Boyd, eds., *Problem-Finding in Educational Administration: Trends in Research and Theory* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1979), 133-54; Grant Harman, "Continuities and Research Gaps in the Politics of Education," *Social Science Quarterly* 55 (September 1974):262-81.

2. Roald F. Campbell and L. Jackson Newell, "A Study of Professors of Educational Administration: A Summary," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 9 (Autumn 1973):3-27.

3. Emil J. Haller and Edward S. Hickcox, "Incorporating the Social Sciences in Administrative Preparation Programs: Some Empirical Evidence," in Jack Culbertson et al., eds., *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 33-58.

4. Edward A. Holdaway, "Educational Administration in Canada: Concerns, Research, and Preparation Programs," in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego, eds., *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration* (Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1980).

5. Jack E. Thomas, "An Exploration of the Demand for Specialists in Educational Administration," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 8 (Spring 1972):44-57.

6. Robin H. Farquhar and W. Michael Martin, "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders," *Phi Delta Kappan* 54 (September 1972):26-30.

7. Ian E. Housego, "Administration and Policy-Making in Contemporary Education: The Contemporary Predicament," in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego, eds., *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration* (Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1980), 380-90.

8. Harold W. Downey, "Politics and Expertise in Educational Policy-Making," in J. H. A. Wallin, ed., *The Politics of Canadian Education* (Edmonton, Alberta: Western Industrial Research Centre, 1977).

9. See Housego, "Administration and Policy-Making in Education," for a more elaborate discussion.

10. For an elaboration see Grant Harman, "Policy-Making and the Policy Process in Education," in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego, eds., *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration* (Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1980), 54-75.

11. Carol Camp Yeakey, "Emerging Policy Research in Educational Research and Decisionmaking," in Edmond W. Gordon, ed., *Review of Research in Education X* (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1983), 255-301.

12. Harman, "Policy-Making and the Policy Process in Education," 73.

13. Jean Hills, "Critical Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators in North America," in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego, eds., *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration* (Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1980), 220-44.

14. For a full set see Ibid.

15. Jack Culbertson, "Educational Administration: Where We Are and Where We Are Going," in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego, eds., *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration* (Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1980), 322-53.

16. For a casual survey see Ibid., 333.

17. For general theoretical reviews see Donald J. Willower, "Theory in Educational Administration," *Journal of Educational Administration* 13 (May 1975):77-91 and Eddy J. Van Meter, "Theory in Educational Administration: Instructional and Content Concerns," *Journal of Educational Administration* 15 (October 1977):194-209.

18. Andrew W. Halpin, ed., *Administrative Theory in Education* (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958).

19. Scribner, *The Politics of Education*.

20. Daniel E. Griffiths, ed., *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

21. Culbertson et al., eds., *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 139-64.

22. David W. Minar, "Political Science: An Overview of the Discipline," in Jack Culbertson et al., eds., *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 139-64.

23. Willower, "Theory in Educational Administration," 85.

24. Culbertson, "Educational Administration: Where We Are and Where We Are Going," 324.

25. Keith Goldhammer, "Using Social Scientific Concepts in the Preparation of Educational Administrators," in Jack Culbertson et al., eds., *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 356-69.

26. Ibid., 357.

27. Howard E. McCurdy and Robert E. Cleary, "The Contribution of Doctoral Research to Public Administration" (Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, Portland, Oregon, 1982), 2.

28. Campbell and Newell, "Study of Professors of Educational Administration," 23.

29. Paula Silver and Dennis Spuck, *Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States* (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1978) and Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand, eds., *Educational Administration: The Developing Decade* (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1977).

30. Similar analogies between management and public administration have been developed by Donald E. Stokes, "An Educational Development Role for NASPAA" (Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, Portland, Oregon, October, 1982).

31. William A. Harrison, Jr., "Social Science Disciplines and Content Selection," in Jack Culbertson et al., eds., *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 370-90.

Dr. Kirkpatrick is professor and department head of political science at Texas A & M University. A former National Science Foundation fellow, Professor Kirkpatrick is a research consultant to a number of public and private organizations, immediate past president of the Southwestern Social Science Association, and chair of the executive council, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. He has published extensively and is active in several political science and social science research organizations. He is currently conducting a 50-state study into the politics and administration of statewide higher education governing agencies.

Institute for School Executives

The Institute for School Executives (ISE) was established to promote the professional development of executives responsible for providing educational leadership. ISE was created as a result of the ever-increasing expressions of concern regarding the need for school district-University cooperative activities in the areas of instruction, research, and service.

Currently, over 130 Iowa and Illinois districts and agencies hold ISE membership, employing in excess of 1,200 administrators.

School districts pay $100 annually for membership in the institute. All administrators in a member district are considered members and are eligible to participate in ISE programs.

Programs offered by ISE during the 1983-84 school year will have included

1. *Seminars.* Eight one-day seminars, which typically attract in excess of 150 participants, are held throughout the year. Recovery fees are assessed for seminars.
2. *A Learner-Design Program.* During the fall term, special lectures are presented in regularly scheduled courses and ISE members are eligible to attend on a "seats-available" basis. Twenty-three special lectures will have been presented by eight faculty members during the fall semester this year. This program is offered without fee.
3. *Tele-Consulting.* An incoming WATS line provides ISE members with direct access to faculty in the Division of Educational Administration at The University of Iowa. Frequent inquiries are made by ISE members regarding recent research findings, source materials, and general information or advice regarding specific on-the-job problems.
4. *Great Books, Art, and Music Enrichment Program.* This ISE program will have brought 24 practicing administrators to campus for four coordinated full-day programs in literature, art, and music. These programs are presented by outstanding university scholars and are designed for both personal and professional growth. Scholars were selected from ISE member applications. This program is offered without cost.
5. *Publications of the Executive Review.* The *Executive Review* is published eight times annually and over 2,000 copies are distributed throughout the United States. It is considered to be one of the preeminent research-based educational publications in the U.S.

For additional information about ISE, contact the address below.

The Institute for School Executives
210LC, The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
Iowa WATS 800-272-6498, or
(319) 353-3032

Special Graduate Assistantships in Education

The Iowa Testing Programs and the Iowa Measurement Research Foundation provide funds to support a limited number of half-time, special graduate assistantships in education. Students admitted to or pursuing any of the advanced degree programs offered by the College of Education are eligible to apply, provided they are United States or Canadian citizens. The assistantships are for the academic year only, are renewable for a limited number of years, and provide a stipend of $7,000, and waiver of the nonresident portion of tuition. Holders work under the direction of a faculty member on scholarly projects and are ordinarily expected to enroll for not less than 9 nor more than 12 semester hours per semester. All candidates must submit transcripts of all college work completed (undergraduate as well as graduate), three recommendation forms, and scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) Aptitude Test. For special application forms write to Leonard S. Feldt, Chair; Selection Committee, 334 Lindquist Center, College of Education. The application deadline is March 1, 1984.

THE EXECUTIVE REVIEW
Published eight times a year by

The University of Iowa
210 Lindquist Center
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

William C. Bozeman, *Editor*
George A. Chambers, *Director*

43331/1:-43